

REMARKS

The Office Action dated February 23, 2005 has been received and reviewed by the applicant. Claims 1-20 are in the application. Claims 1-4, 8, 9 and 10 stand rejected. Claims 5, 6, 7, 11, 12 and 13 stand objected to. Claims 14-20 are allowed.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Koyama, Pub. No. US 2003/0151685 A1 (hereinafter referred to as Koyama). Claims 1 and 2 have been combined to clearly distinguish the invention.

The Examiner states that Koyama meets all of the limitations of claim 1 and 2 including a non-volatile memory device connected to the reset transistor and the photodiode. The Examiner cites paragraph [0076] lines 15 – 16 of Koyama and Fig. 1 item 20A to support this contention.

Claims 1 and 2 have been combined and amended. Newly amended claim 2 recites an image sensor comprising a reset transistor, a photodiode and a non-volatile memory. The amended claim 2 places the reset transistor, the photodiode and the non-volatile memory in the imaging cell 200 (i.e., image sensor).

Koyama on the other hand includes a non-volatile memory that is elsewhere in the camera system and does not teach a non-volatile memory that is a component of an imaging cell or image sensor. Paragraph [0076] of Koyama lines 12 – 16, states:

Specifically, for example, the pixel 20A whose electric charge accumulation region N1 is constantly fixed to a predetermined potential is detected and the address of this pixel 20A is stored in a non-volatile memory contained in the camera system.

It is clear from the excerpt that the pixels 20A are stored in a non-volatile memory that is located elsewhere and not in the image cell 200 or image sensor. Therefore, Koyama does not teach a non-volatile memory within the image sensor as claimed in the instant application.

Claims 3, 4, and 8 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being anticipated by Koyama, Pub. No. US 2003/0151685 A1 (hereinafter referred to as Koyama) in view of Shizukuishi, Pub. No. US 2004/0056176.

For the foregoing reasons claim 2 is considered patentable over Koyama. Claims 3, 4 and 8 are directly and indirectly dependent on claim 2. The Applicant

takes the position that claims 3, 4 and 8 are now allowable based on their dependence on allowable base claim 2.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being anticipated by Koyama, modified by Shizukuishi, in further view of Tempel Pub. No. 2004/0042296.

For the foregoing reasons claim 2 is considered patentable over Koyama. Claims 9 and 10 are directly and indirectly dependent on claim 2. The Applicant takes the position that claims 9 and 10 are now allowable based on their dependence on allowable base claim 2.


Claims 5, 6, 7, 11, 12 and 13 are objected to as being depending on a rejected base claim but be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 5, 6, 7, 11, 12 and 13 have been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims or are now dependent on allowable base claims. Therefore, these claims are considered allowable.

Claims 14 – 20 are allowed.

Should the Examiner consider that additional amendments are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the favor is requested of a telephone call to the undersigned counsel for the purpose of discussing such amendments.

For the reasons set forth above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 36,390

Peyton C. Watkins/lam
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-8282
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.